U.S. Application No. 10/084,886

REMARKS

General Remarks

With this Amendment, Applicants add new Claims 12-19. Therefore, Claims 1-19 are all the claims currently pending in the present application.

With the current Office Action, the Examiner returns an initialed and signed copy of the PTO-Form 1449 filed with the March 3, 2002 IDS. The Examiner also acknowledges Applicants' claim to foreign priority and the receipt of the certified copy of the priority document.

Figures 4, 5, and 6 stand objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.84(p)(4-5) for various errors in the numbering of illustrated elements.

Claims 4-8 stand objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(c) as improperly multiply dependent on a multiply dependent claim.

Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Figures and Specification

Elements 14b and 14d of Figure 4. The Examiner objects to Figure 4 as containing a reference number, 14b, which is not discussed in the specification, and a reference number 14d, which is described in the specification at page 40, as both a mirror and a half mirror.

The above-discussed errors relating to elements 14b and 14d are, in fact, the result of a typographical error in the specification. Therefore, Applicants amend the paragraph beginning at

page 39, line 16, as shown. The amendment changes "... half mirrors 13, 14c, and 14d..." to instead read "... half mirrors 13, 14c, and 14b...".

Element 24 of Figures 5 and 6. The Examiner objects to Figures 5 and 6 as both containing reference number 24, which is used to designate a spatial modulator in Figure 5 (see page 41 of the specification) and an inlet in Figure 6 (see page 51 of the specification). This is the result of a typographical error in the figures and the specification.

Therefore, Applicants amend Figure 6 and the paragraph beginning on page 50, line 24, as shown, so that the inlet is instead labeled with reference number 36. Reference number 36 is not otherwise used in any figure.

Elements 25, 29, and 34 of Figure 6. The Examiner objects to Figure 6 as containing three reference numbers, 25, 29, and 34, which are not discussed in the specification.

Regarding reference number 34, which clearly refers to a temperature control section,

Applicants amend the paragraph beginning at page 50, line 24, as shown, to include reference to
this number.

Regarding reference numbers 25 and 29, these numbers were included in Figure 6 due to a typographical error, and therefore, Applicants amend Figure 6, as shown, to remove these numbers.

Therefore, due to the above amendments to the specification and figures, Applicants submit that the figures are currently in proper form and respectfully request that the objections to the figures be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim Objections

Regarding the Examiner's objection to Claims 4-7 as being improperly multiply dependent, Applicants amend each of Claims 4-7, as shown, to be dependent on one of Claims 1 and 2.

Regarding the Examiner's objection to Claim 8 as being improperly multiply dependent,
Applicants amend Claim 8, as shown, to be dependent on one of Claims 17 and 18.

Therefore, Applicants submit that these claims are currently in proper form and respectfully request that the Examiner's objection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim Rejections Under §112

Regarding the Examiner's rejection of Claim 1, under §112, second paragraph, due to the apparent requirement of forming a hydrophobic layer by irradiating a surface to form hydrophilic areas, Applicants amend Claim 1, as shown, in order to clarify the two recited steps of: a) forming a uniform layer of a hydrophobic substance; and b) irradiating the surface to form hydrophilic areas. Applicants respectfully submit that this amendment is not intended to narrow the scope of the original claim, but is rather for precision of language and to explicitly recite within the claim what was believed to have already been implicitly defined therein. Accordingly, this amendment does not foreclose application of reasonable equivalents.

This amendment is supported by the specification at least at page 4, lines 10-15, as mentioned by the Examiner.

Regarding the Examiner's rejection of Claims 1-3 under §112, second paragraph, because the preamble to these claims is allegedly unclear because the claims fail to disclose a printing

step, Applicants amend the preambles of Claims 2-7, as shown. Applicants respectfully submit that these amendments are not intended to narrow the scope of the original claim, but are rather for precision of language and to explicitly recite within the preambles what was believed to have already been implicitly defined in the claims. Accordingly, these amendments do not foreclose application of reasonable equivalents.

Therefore, Applicants submit that Claims 1-3 are currently in proper form and respectfully request that the §112 rejections of these claims be reconsidered and withdrawn.

New Claims

With this Amendment, Applicants add new Claims 12-19 in order more fully to cover various aspects of Applicants' invention as disclosed in the specification.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111

U.S. Application No. 10/084,886

Q68579

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

Laura Moskowitz

Registration No. 55,470

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC

Telephone: (202) 293-7060 Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE 23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: June 29, 2004



Appl. No. 10/084,886

Docket No. Q68579

Amdt. Dated June 29, 2004

Reply to Office action of March 29, 2004

Annotated marked-up Drawing

5/5

FIG. 5




FIG. 6

